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Assistant Editor
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BioMed Central Ltd

Re: MS: 1147347596118064
Aerosolized Amikacin for Treatment of Pulmonary Nontuberculous Mycobacterial Infections: An Observational Case Series

Dear Dr. Le,
We have addressed the comments and suggestions of the two referees, and have incorporated the changes and additions into our resubmitted manuscript. I have outlined the specific changes below for ease of perusal by you and the referees. We feel that these changes have clarified our manuscript, and welcome your additional review. Please notify me at your convenience if there are any other points that we have not addressed.
Sincerely,
, MD

Replies to Referees:

Referee #1:
Q1: We have changed the title to read “Mycobacterium avium” rather than the more generic NTM that was previously used.

Referee #2:
Q1, 2: We have added to the Introduction specific comments regarding the papers by Parola et al. and Sacks et al., (page 6, lines 162-3) and have added these papers to our reference list.
Q3.1: Culture specimens for all subjects were expectorated sputum samples. This is described in the text (page 7, lines 180-82; and page 8, lines 206-9). We did not make any determination of subspecies (avium versus intracellulare) in these subjects, and so do not have that data.
Q3.2: The Table now describes more about the antibiotic therapy in these subjects prior to the initiation of inhaled amikacin.
Q3.3: For clarification, the Table now notes that subject 6 was intolerant of ethambutol and rifampin (rather than that the MAC was resistant to these agents).